



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,201	11/28/2001	John F. L. Potts	10559-514001/P12418	4070
20985	7590	12/15/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC			ZHOU, TING	
12390 EL CAMINO REAL			ART UNIT	
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081			PAPER NUMBER	

2173

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/997,201

Applicant(s)

POTTS ET AL.

Examiner

Ting Zhou

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 7 October 2004 have been received and entered. Claims 1-29 as amended are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-11, 14-16, 18-20, 22-25 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Royalty U.S. Publication 2003/0038844.

Referring to claims 1 and 16, Royalty teaches a method and computer readable medium comprising operating in a first mode to display selected personal data originating with a personal information device (PID) in a first display area of a display (displaying information from a non-certified source, such as a laptop computer on a first display area 32 of display 26) (page 1, paragraph 0009, page 2, paragraph 0010 and page 3, paragraph 0026); and switching to a second mode to display data in a second display area of the display (displaying certified information received from the microprocessor of the flight deck in the second display area 28 of display 26) (page 3, paragraph 0026 and further shown in Figures 1 and 3).

Referring to claim 2, Royalty teaches receiving the selected personal data over a communications link (connecting a portable computer to the display via a data connection) (page 3, paragraph 0025).

Referring to claims 4 and 18, Royalty teaches switching between the first mode and the second mode in response to a mode event (if it is determined that the display area cannot display information from the portable computer, such as when the aircraft is in critical stages of operation, then the display is prevented from displaying information from the non-certified source and only displays information from the certified source) (page 4, paragraphs 0031 and 0033).

Referring to claims 5 and 19, Royalty teaches synchronizing changes to the selected personal data with the source of the selected personal data (information from the portable computer is displayed on the flight deck's display; therefore, as new information is received from the portable computer, the displayed information on the flight deck display is similarly synchronized to reflect the new information) (page 3, paragraph 0025 and page 4, paragraph 0033).

Referring to claims 6 and 20, Royalty teaches an apparatus and system comprising a source of personal information device data (portable device) (page 3, paragraph 0025), and a computing device coupled to the source of the PID data (flight deck display device connected to the portable computer) (page 3, paragraph 0025), the computing device comprising a display having a first display area (display area 32 for displaying non-certified information from the portable computer) (page 3, paragraph 0026 and Figures 1 and 3) and a second display area (display area 28 for displaying certified information) (page 3, paragraph 0026 and Figures 1 and

3), a first computing module coupled to the display, the first computing module comprising a first processor configured to operate in a first mode to display user specific data received from a personal information device (PID) in the first display area (the processor of the portable computer connected to the display, which could store personal data from the user, sends information to the flight deck computer to display information from the non-certified source on a first display area 32 of display 26) (page 2, paragraphs 0028-0029 and Figure 4), and a second computing module coupled to the display, the second computing module comprising a second processor configured to switch to a second mode to display data in the second display area of the display (the processor of the flight deck can display received certified information in the second display area 28 of display 26) (page 3, paragraph 0026 and further shown in Figures 1 and 3).

Referring to claims 8 and 22, Royalty teaches the second processor is configured to process a mode event that causes a switch between the first mode and the second mode (if it is determined that the display area cannot display information from the portable computer, such as when the aircraft is in critical stages of operation, then the display is prevented from displaying information from the non-certified source and only displays information from the certified source) (page 4, paragraphs 0031 and 0033).

Referring to claims 9 and 23, Royalty teaches receiving the user-specific data over a communications link (connecting a portable computer to the display via a data connection) (page 3, paragraph 0025).

Referring to claims 10 and 24, Royalty teaches the first processor consumes less power per unit time than the second processor (since the first processor is a processor for a smaller portable computing device and the second processor is a processor for a larger and more data

intensive processor for a flight deck avionics display, the processor for the portable device would consume less power than the processor for the flight deck).

Referring to claims 11 and 25, Royalty teaches the size of the first display area is smaller than the size of the second display area (the display area for displaying information from the portable computer is less than the entire display area for displaying certified information) (page 2, paragraph 0010).

Referring to claims 14 and 28, Royalty teaches the second processor is configured to synchronize changes to the PID data with a source of the PID data (information from the portable computer is displayed on the flight deck's display; therefore, as new information is received from the portable computer, the displayed information on the flight deck display is similarly synchronized to reflect the new information) (page 3, paragraph 0025 and page 4, paragraph 0033).

Referring to claims 15 and 29, Royalty teaches the display is shared by the first computing module and the second computing module (the display 26 with display area 28 can be used to display information from certified and non-certified sources) (page 2, paragraph 0023, page 3, paragraph 0026 and Figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3, 7, 12, 17, 21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royalty U.S. Publication 2003/0038844, as applied to claims 1, 6, 16 and 20 above, and Dickie U.S. Publication 2003/0041206.

Referring to claims 3, 7, 17 and 21, Royalty teaches all of the limitations as applied to claims 1, 6, 16 and 20 above. However, Royalty fails to explicitly teach operating in a first mode in response to a power-on event. Dickie teaches a method of displaying data from a device communicating with a host in a first display area (status display area 124 displays information received from the connected PDA) (Dickie: page 1, paragraph 0017 and page 2, paragraph 0028) and displaying data from the host in a second display area (the portable laptop computer shown in Figure 1 also has a display area 110 that can display information from the computer system) (Dickie: page 1, paragraph 0015) similar to that of Royalty. In addition, Dickie further teaches operating in the first mode in response to a power-on event (when the devices are powered on, the user can enter data into the PDA and the entered data is subsequently synchronized with the portable computer and displayed on display area 124) (Dickie: page 2, paragraphs 0027-0029). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Royalty and Dickie before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method of communicating and displaying data from a remote device of Royalty to include the power-on event taught by Dickie. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to save user's time by automatically displaying information from a default source upon turning on the computing device; this further allows users to access, view and manipulate information easier and faster.

Referring to claims 12 and 26, Royalty teaches all of the limitations as applied to claims 6 and 20 above. However, Royalty fails to explicitly teach the data from the laptop includes electronic mail (EMAIL) data. Dickie teaches a method of displaying data from a device communicating with a host in a first display area (status display area 124 displays information received from the connected PDA) (Dickie: page 1, paragraph 0017 and page 2, paragraph 0028) and displaying data from the host in a second display area (the portable laptop computer shown in Figure 1 also has a display area 110 that can display information from the computer system) (Dickie: page 1, paragraph 0015) similar to that of Royalty. In addition, Dickie further teaches the PID data includes electronic (EMAIL) data (the PDA can communicate and synchronize data such as email with the laptop computer) (Dickie: page 1, paragraph 0013). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Royalty and Dickie before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method of communicating and displaying data from a remote device of Royalty to include email data taught by Dickie. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to allow users to access and transfer information from a small handheld device to a computer system that allows easier viewing and manipulation of the information.

4. Claims 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royalty U.S. Publication 2003/0038844, as applied to claims 6 and 20 above, and Gettemy et al. U.S. Patent 6,545,862.

Referring to claims 13 and 27, Royalty teaches all of the limitations as applied to claims 6 and 20 above. However, Royalty fails to explicitly teach the display includes an organic light

emitting diode. Gettemy et al. teach a method for transmitting and receiving information from a portable computer system through a communication channel (Gettemy et al.: column 4, lines 41-44) similar to that of Royalty. In addition, Gettemy et al. further teach the display includes an organic light emitting diode (Gettemy et al.: column 7, lines 6-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Royalty and Gettemy et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the information transmitting and receiving method of Royalty to include the organic light emitting diode display taught by Gettemy et al. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to display information on a device that is ultra thin, power efficient, high contrast and has a fast response rate, supporting full motion video and special effects.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 7 October 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6. Applicant asserts that Royalty nowhere teaches that non-certified source 30 may be a personal information device (PID) because the portable computer mentioned in Royalty may not be said to be a "personal information device". The examiner respectfully disagrees. As recited in page 1, paragraph 0006, laptops are personal electronic devices (PEDs) that are portable; in addition, Royalty teaches that the non-certified source 30 can be any source of information that is not a certified source of information, including, for example, portable computers, as recited in column 3, paragraph 0025. According to <http://www.hyperdictionary.com>, a portable computer

is “a personal computer that can easily be carried by hand”. As can be seen, portable computers such as laptop computers are versatile devices that can store a plurality of information, including personal data and therefore, the laptop computer connected to non-certified source 30 can display information stored in the laptop computer, including personal data.

7. Applicant also asserts that there is no motivation to modify Royalty with the teachings of Dickie. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Royalty teaches a device capable of displaying information from a connected portable computer, as recited in page 1, paragraph 0009 and page 3, paragraph 0025. Dickie teaches a device with a similar ability to display information on a host display from a connected device, as recited in page 1, paragraphs 0013-0017. In addition, Dickie states that such dual connected devices can synchronize event data and other information so that the two devices both contain the same information. Therefore, one would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Royalty and Dickie, producing a device that displays information from a connected source upon power-on, in order to provide a default source of information allowing users to access, view and manipulate information easily. Furthermore, the applicant asserts that displaying personal data on the aircraft's flight deck display would provide both a distraction for the flight crew and another avenue through which the aircraft's data processing system could be disrupted. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The laptop can display a variety of personal data, such as the flight crew's schedule information and weather data, which will help the flight crew navigate the aircraft instead of distract the crew; also, one of the objectives of Royalty is to detect application spoofing, so that the flight crew is aware of when information from a non-certified source is displayed; therefore, the display of personal data on

the aircraft's flight deck display upon power-on allows the flight crew to be able to tell immediately that information from a non-certified source, which is vulnerable and subject to corruption, is displayed, enabling the flight crew to be aware of the potential problems.

8. Therefore, it can be seen that Royalty, and combinations of Royalty and Dickie anticipate the limitations of the subject invention.

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-4058.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

1 December 2004



JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 210